

33. (Amended) A cleaning composition according to claim 1 wherein the organic acid is comprised at a level of from 1% to 20% by weight of total composition.

41. (Amended) A cleaning composition according to claim 38 wherein said level of hydrogen peroxide are maintained with a controlled releasing system.

47. (Amended) A cleaning composition according to claim 1 further comprising a bleach system.

58. (Amended) A method of cleaning comprising the step of contacting a hard surface such as a floor, a wall and a bathroom tile, with a cleaning composition comprising a surfactant system, an oxidoreductase with an α/β -hydrolase fold and a catalytic triad consisting of the amino acid residues serine, histidine and aspartic acid, a hydrogen peroxide source and an organic acid.

REMARKS

Rejection under 35 USC § 112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 32, 33 41, 47 and 58 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant(s) regard as the invention. The Examiner's attention is directed to the "Amendments" section of the instant communication, in which Applicants have amended the aforementioned claims only to obviate the Examiner's rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to Claims 32, 33 41, 47 and 58 under 35 USC § 112 are therefore respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) over Oxenboll in view of Van Pee

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 27-49 and 54-62 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,834,280 to Oxenboll et al. (hereinafter "Oxenboll") in view of WO Patent No. 96/06909 to Van Pee (hereinafter "Van Pee"). Specifically, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to modify Oxenboll with the oxidoreductase of Van Pee to yield the detergent composition of the present disclosure. See Paper No. 9; page 4. The Examiner additionally asserts that the modification of Oxenboll would have been obvious because Oxenboll purportedly teaches detergent compositions that may additionally comprises one or more other enzymes. See Paper No. 9; page 4. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection.

Initially, Applicants wish to address certain case-law cited by the Examiner in Paper No. 9 and particularly *In re Keller*, which the Examiner cites as holding, "one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references." The Applicants submit that, should the Applicants provide argument overcoming a rejection based upon one reference used in a combination, the combination would necessarily fail. Indeed, the courts have established, references cannot